

Sub  
C5  
cancel

electrically connecting the wireless telephone with the docking surface of the docking station such that the display control circuit in the docking station receives image data from the transceiver, the wireless telephone being attached to the docking station at the connection port; and  
operating the display control circuit connected to the transceiver and the matrix display to display an image on the display using the image data.

---

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

Claims 18 and 19 have been amended to make the language consistent with the claim from which they depend. Claims 1, 7, 17 and 22 have also been amended to include a docking surface for a handheld wireless telephone.

Claims 1-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilska et al. (United Kingdom Patent No. 2,289,555) in view of Fan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,126).

Of the twenty five pending claims, claims 1, 7, 17 and 22 are independent. Claims 1, 7, and 17 each recite a docking system for a wireless telephone. Claim 22 recites a method of displaying an image on a docking system in conjunction with a wireless telephone. None of the independent claims are suggested or disclosed by the prior art cited, in that one or more elements recited in the claims are not suggested or disclosed in the prior art.

The Office Action cites Wilska for disclosing a docking system for a wireless telephone comprising: a display housing having a plurality of control elements and a connection port [8] that electrically connects a display circuit within the display housing to a wireless telephone housing attached to the display housing such that the image data received by the wireless telephone is received by the display circuit and a liquid crystal display.

Wilska is further cited in the Office Action for disclosing "a display subhousing [9] carried by the housing and moveable between a storage and operating position (see Figures 7-9)." Wilska is also cited in the Office Action for disclosing "a docking system [17] for a wireless telephone [17]." The undersigned respectively disagrees with the interpretation of what is disclosed in Wilska as discussed below.

The Office Action acknowledges that Wilska does not disclose an active matrix LCD, a light source nor a magnifying image lens. Fan is cited in the Office Action for disclosing these elements.

The docking system as in recited in both claims 1 and 7 has a housing having a connection port that electrically connects a display circuit within the housing to a handheld wireless telephone. The active matrix liquid crystal display in the display housing or display subhousing of the docking system has a small active area (an active area of less than 100 mm<sup>2</sup>) with a high resolution (an array of at least 75,000 pixel electrodes).

Neither Wilska nor Fan, alone or in combination, disclose the Applicants' invention as claimed in claims 1 and 7. Neither Wilska nor Fan disclose a display having at least 75,000 pixel electrodes and an active area of less than 100mm<sup>2</sup>. Wilska, in fact, teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention by disclosing on page 4, paragraph 2 a display having at least 640 x 200 pixels<sup>2</sup> [sic] and having dimensions in the order of 130 mm x 70 mm; The Wilska's display has an active area of 9100 mm<sup>2</sup>. The active area of Wilska is ninety-one (91) times greater than the active area claimed by the Applicants. Fan, also, does not disclose the array size or active area of the display as claimed by the Applicants. Wilska likewise does not disclose a connection port between a housing and a wireless telephone. In fact, contrary to the interpretation in the Office Action, Wilska does not disclose a distinct housing and wireless telephone as evident by reference numeral 17 used for both the docking system and the wireless telephone in the Office Action.

Claims 1 and 7 are allowable. Because Applicants' claims 1 and 7 are not obvious in light of Wilska and Fan, either alone or in combination, the claims should be allowed to issue. Claims 2-6 which depend upon claim 1 and claims 8-16 which depend upon claim 7 should also be allowed to issue, at least, for the reasons presented above.

With respect to Applicants' independent claim 17, the combination of Wilska and Fan do not suggest or disclose the invention as claimed by the Applicants. Claim 17 recites in addition to numerous other elements, a display subhousing module moveable from a storage position to an operating position relative to the housing. The undersigned does not find a suggestion of a display subhousing moving relative to a housing; in fact, the display [9] is part of the housing [1]. Figures 7 - 9 of Wilska cited in the Office Action for disclosing the display moving relative to the housing actually show a keyboard [28] or digitizer [29] positioned relative to the housing [1] which contains the display [9]. Furthermore, as indicated above, Wilska does not disclose a

connection port. Claim 17 should therefore be allowed to issue. Claims 18-21, which depend upon claim 17, should also be allowed to issue, at least, for the reason given above.

With respect to Applicants' independent claim 22, Wilska and Fan do not combine to form the method claimed by the Applicants. Claim 22 recites a step of

electrically connecting the wireless telephone with the docking surface of the docking station such that the display control circuit in the docking station receives image data from the transceiver, the wireless telephone being attached to the docking station at the connection port

Neither Wilska nor Fan alone or in combination suggest or disclose the claimed step. Claim 22 is allowable.


Claims 23-25, which depend upon claim 22, should also be allowed to issue, at least, for the reason given above.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (781) 861-6240.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By   
Raymond I. Brattomesso, Jr.  
Registration No. 33,840  
Telephone (781) 861-6240  
Facsimile (781) 861-9540

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4799

Dated: 18 JANUARY 2001